



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"The archbishop, of course, refused to sign the prescribed formulary, although the nuncio (who had been stopped in his flattering circumlocutions) pressed on him, 'It is but a form; all that is asked is, that you will write your name on a slip of paper, and then all will be right.' Van Santen replied indignantly, 'A form has meaning, and I cannot subscribe a document, and confirm it by the solemn obligation of an oath, unless I am certain in my conscience before God of the truth of that to which I put my name.'

"THE NUNCIO.—'But you are bound in your conscience before God to acknowledge the authority of the holy father; and as his holiness assures you of the truth of the formulary, that is sufficient to remove every scruple. Any doubt in your own mind is but a private opinion; while, on the other hand, you have the full authority of the Church both to *instruct* you that the formulary states what is true, and to *require* you to acknowledge this undoubted fact.'

"VAN SANTEN.—'I have read the "Augustinus" of Jansenius more than once through; I know that the five propositions, as condemned, are not contained in that book: how can I, then, as an honest man and a Christian, subscribe a declaration as true which denies a simple fact? I have to do with God and my conscience, even if the Pope and the whole Church should be misinformed. As they cannot alter a fact, so they can have no authority from God to require me to sign my name to a declaration which contradicts a fact.'

"The nuncio then sought to illustrate the Romish idea of submission in every respect to the holy see, so as to convince the archbishop that he was wrong. In this endeavour he used the following illustration:—'You see, M. Van Santen, that the table at which we are sitting is covered with a green cloth. Now, supposing that the father of a family were to prohibit his children absolutely from entering this room, or even looking into it—well, but if one of the children were to look in through the key-hole, and were thus by disobedience to acquire the knowledge that the cloth on the table is green, how then would the case stand? If the father were to make out an inventory of the furniture in the room, and if he were (whether by mistake or design, it matters not) to describe this green cloth as being red; and if he were, on the ground of his parental authority, to require each of his children, as relying on their father's information, to subscribe this inventory as perfectly correct, it would not be competent to the child who had seen the cloth to act upon the knowledge he had gained by disobedience, and to refuse to subscribe the statement in which its colour was said to be red. The father had a right to forbid his children to look into the room: he had also a right to prescribe to his children what they should sign; and no act of prior disobedience on the part of any of them could take away the obligation of unhesitating compliance.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'You have brought forward a curious illustration; but how would you apply it? and how would you vindicate, even in such a case, the subscription to a known untruth?'

"CAPPUCCINI.—'There is no untruth at all supposed in the case that I have put: the child is absolutely bound to believe his parent; and, as the only ground he could have for any scruple of conscience would be part of his sinful disobedience, he ought to say, "the command of God requires me to obey my father; I must, therefore, obey him in this point, which involves the sacrifice of my own opinion; and as I am bound, in duty to God, to declare my belief that the cloth is red, I may reasonably suppose that my eyes were mistaken when I saw it. Perhaps a sunbeam hindered me from seeing the colour correctly; or, perhaps, in punishment for my disobedience, an optical illusion was sent to deceive me. Any of these considerations is enough to justify me fully in subscribing my full belief that the object is really red, and not green."

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'But how do you apply the idea of knowledge obtained through disobedience to the question of fact involved in subscription to the formulary?'

"CAPPUCCINI.—'Listen, that I may instruct you. You are well aware that no theological virtue shines more brightly than *implicit obedience*; the Holy Scriptures, the fathers and doctors of the Church, and the practice of all the saints, so fully commend this virtue, that there is no need for me to insist on it, at least in conferring with you. Obedience would require that the work of Jansenius, entitled "Augustinus," should not be read, since it was condemned by the bull of Pope Urban VIII. (*In eminenti*). Any knowledge, therefore, which any person now has of the contents of that book must have been obtained through a transgression of that obedience to which he was bound. No one can have a right to know what the book contains any further than as relates to the condemned propositions, and that only from the constitution that condemns them: you ought, therefore, as a submissive child, not to insist on acting on the knowledge obtained through disobedience, but you should own with humility that in reading the condemned book you may have been mistaken: nay, that you must have been mistaken—that God did not give you clear light when you were thus acting in presumption; so that all you have to do is to subscribe the formulary purely and simply, and receive the blessing which will result from giving up your own will, and thus have the satisfaction of restoring the peace of the Church.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'If the peace of the

Church be in question, why does the Pope break it on the ground of a mere question of fact? You have already described the subscription as a *form* merely; why, then, should such importance be attached to a mere form?'

"CAPPUCCINI.—'I have argued the point simply to satisfy your scruples, and the illustrations which I used had no other end. I cannot suppose that you will obstinately maintain your own private opinion, especially when you remember that so many wise and learned men are agreed that the five propositions are in Jansenius.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'I do not wish to set my judgment above that of others: I only ask, let the five condemned propositions be shown me in Jansenius, and let it be shown that they are there stated in the sense in which they were condemned; that is, *not* in the sense in which anything similar is found in the works of St. Augustine: you know the formulary goes this length, and the Pope never professed to condemn St. Augustine, one of the fathers and doctors of the Church; and he could not condemn any propositions, if they are taken in an orthodox sense, for instance, in that of St. Augustine.'

"CAPPUCCINI.—'It will not do for me to argue on points which only require simple submission: it is easy to misunderstand St. Augustine; and perhaps we should wander from the point if we were to inquire into his meaning on these deep subjects.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'But with regard to the formulary, it is necessary for me to examine what St. Augustine has written, and what is contained in Jansenius; for you call on me to declare solemnly that Jansenius has misrepresented the doctrine of St. Augustine. How can I declare this if I do not know what the doctrine is, and whether it has been misrepresented or not?'

"CAPPUCCINI.—'Surely we may compose this slight difference: it is only by drawing refined distinctions of the sense in which words are taken that you can object to subscribe. You do not know how earnest is the goodwill and sympathy of the holy father towards you; his paternal heart longs to welcome you as a returning child: surely you may believe him when he assures you that the meaning of certain propositions is that which the Church has defined them to be. You do not know in what favour many of your sentiments are with the Pope; for instance, the Church has never rejected the doctrine of "efficacious grace," which you esteem so highly: while this is not condemned, you see how everything may be adjusted by merely your name being affixed to a form: a drop of ink and a few seconds will put all right. This is all that the holy father asks.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'Am I, then, to understand that his Holiness asks that in a solemn oath I should call God to witness that I do believe what I do not believe; what the Pope knows that I do not believe; what Almighty God, the Searcher of Hearts, knows that I do not believe? Is Catholic unity to be maintained by perjury—an awful sin before both God and man? And do you mean to say that if I knowingly commit this crime it will be what the Pope desires and demands?'

"CAPPUCCINI.—'The holy father only requires that from you which lies in the province of his authority. When the Church instructs you what to believe, you are bound to silence all trifling scruples.'

"ARCHBISHOP VAN SANTEN.—'I cannot conceal my indignation at your endeavours to make me declare, in the presence of Almighty God, that I do believe a point that I do not believe: my conscience is subject to Him, and, by His aid, I will act in His fear. I must continue to refuse to put my name to a formulary which I reject: my hand must not contradict my heart.'

"The nuncio felt that this was decisive: the firmness of the archbishop was not to be overcome with sophistries, which, even if they would pass current at Rome, would be of but little worth amongst any who understand what acting in the fear of God is, instead of in submission to the Pope.

"Cappucini said no more about the differences being slight, or about the Church of Rome not rejecting the doctrine of 'efficacious grace': the tone was quite changed:—'I have patiently endeavoured to convince you of your error, and thus by gentle means to lead back your wandering steps; I have not, therefore, referred to the position in which you already were standing, as having been for some time excommunicated by the Church. Your consecration as an archbishop is null and void; you are incapable of exercising any episcopal authority or jurisdiction: and yet the holy see condescended to treat you as if these things were not so, in the cherished hope of restoring a wandering sheep. But, alas! all this condescending love has been rejected by your own presumption and obstinacy; and thus the sentence of solemn excommunication, so far from being removed, is only confirmed: the (so-called) consecration which you have received, and the pretended orders which you confer, are alike sacrilegious, and all who at all communicate with you are themselves schismatical and favourers of here-y, or even heretics themselves.' Oh! that you would return to the one fold of Christ, out of which is no salvation; that you would not urge on to destruction the souls of others as well as your own!'

"Such was Archbishop Van Santen's account of the

^b What right-minded person can fail to see the oppressive character of a proceeding which makes one individual responsible for the alleged heresy of another?

arguments of the nuncio Cappucini; and then he said to me, 'I could smile at the terrors of excommunication which he thus placed before me, having so long known such sentences for as much as they are worth, when given forth on such grounds. I thought of the man born blind in the Gospel, who was excommunicated for owning that Jesus was of God—a sentence which God did not ratify; although it might seem from the law that the priests then had greater power than the successors of St. Peter could now claim' (see Deut. xvii. 10-12)."

THE DUMB VILLAGE.

CHAPTER VIII.

"You certainly have a most eccentric, as well as prolific imagination, my friend Tom," said Mr. R. "There is, however, I fear, but too much to justify your comparisons, which often are as true as they are amusing. I have not been more surprised than shocked at the extent to which many advocates of the Church of Rome lose sight, in the defence of her doctrines, of everything except their determination to make out her cause both in the absence of all proof, and against it. Nothing is, I think, more apparent to any one who will honestly examine into the matter than that they make the justification which they cannot find. And in some instances the effort to set aside opposing evidence is so manifest, that I find it impossible to explain the determination of the evasions by any amount of prejudice or pre-occupation, and am constrained to believe and assert the obstinacy to be wilful, and the dishonesty undoubted."

"Will you kindly adduce a case which presents itself in this light to your mind?" said Father M.

"Unhappily they are so numerous that I have no difficulty in doing so. Take, as one of the most undisguised examples, the note in the Douay Bible on the 64th verse of the vi. chapter St. John's Gospel. What do you say to it?"

A flush of unwonted surprise passed over Father M.'s face at these words. He seemed exceedingly moved. Satisfaction, great and unexpected, was strongly expressed in the emotion which suddenly sprang to his anxious eyes, and passed like a gleam of momentary light over his wasted cheek. He started from his seat, and lifting up his wasted hands, exclaimed in astonishment, "How strange this is. It has been that very note which first awakened my own suspicions, and first shook my faith. Is it not striking that you should have thus lighted upon it?"

"I am not surprised it should do the same with any honest person," said Mr. R., laying his hand tenderly upon the shoulder of the agitated man. "It is not wonderful that a grievous prevarication should sometimes be detected by those whom it designs to delude, and tend to the downfall of a cause which does not hesitate to employ it. Here the attempt to put aside an opportunity of correcting error is so palpable, that no amount of charitable feeling will allow me to speak of it otherwise than as deliberate dishonesty."

"My own mind," replied Father M., "is, I think, tolerably clear on this matter. That note cost me a great strife, and has left a great impression on me. I am not now strong in health, and hence, possibly, have felt somewhat agitated by a coincidence which I can scarcely think to be accidental. I should now, if you please, desire much to hear your views upon it, in order to see if they may, as I hope, confirm my own. I can scarcely express to you how great were the feelings of astonishment, and pain, and shame which I experienced on perceiving the want of candour which first aroused my suspicions, and has ever since confirmed them."

"You shall have my views readily," said Mr. R. "I am not at all surprised at your feelings. For I will say this—that, though as an earnest opponent of the grievous errors of the Church of Rome, I am thankful to find unmistakable opportunities of exposing them, still I have ever felt, and now do feel, deep sorrow that such deceptions (for they are nothing less) should have been introduced; and still more, that they should continue to be, not only tolerated, but directly sanctioned, as they are, by the heads of the Romish Church. I deeply grieve not only that there are so many who, through ignorance and trust, must suffer by such impositions, but also that there are many more, not having a like excuse, who countenance them. Our friend, Tom Connell, however, to judge by his looks, seems so anxious to know all about this matter that you will, I am sure, excuse me if, in order to make it clear to him, I say more than otherwise I should do."

Tom's eyes and ears were witnesses to his genuine interest, and he said—"I thank your reverence; that's just what I wanted. That same note always bothered me. There is such a fog about it. I know they wanted to hide something or other they didn't like to be seen. But the very thing which made me suspect that there was something which wouldn't bear looking at, kept me from finding it. It was all out with me as a poor hungry fellow looking at a fine piece of cold beef through the shop window. There it was, but it only made him the worse because he couldn't get at it. Just like a cute fish little Tommy was reading of the other evening, which, when it sees a great big one coming on with open mouth to swallow it up, squirts out some black thing or other which so darkens the water all about it, that the big fellow only makes his grab for nothing, and gets a mouthful of something he doesn't

like, instead of what he does. Thinks I to myself, my boy, you're a clever schamer, and would make a good Catholic, if you were only the least morsel of a Christian. I couldn't help thinking, your honour, how the little one would be laughing when he heard the chop of the other's teeth, and himself snug out of harm's way. But I couldn't help thinking, too, that myself was just like the great fool of a fish, and that same note like the little fellow which blackened the water to prevent him from seeing where to find what he wanted."

"You have assuredly hit the nail on the head here, Tom, at all events," said Mr. R., smiling at the humorous manner in which our friend confessed, and illustrated his perplexity. "I must try and help you to see more clearly."

"You will not, I trust, Father M.," continued the Rector, "set me down as an uncharitable judge when I speak of instances wherein Roman Catholic writers are, as I firmly believe, justly chargeable with intentional evasions. Wherever a glaring case presents itself which it is impossible to explain except by incapacity or dishonesty, the ability which the controversialists of the Romanist faith exhibit leaves me no alternative but in adopting the latter as the true explanation. I cannot regard this note, among other things, except as a feat of sleight-of-hand so dexterously executed as to baffle the suspicion which it excites. The juggler himself, however, knows the deceit which he practises. Every honest Roman Catholic should reprobate with indignation this blot upon his Bible."

"This note is an attempt to get rid of the argument against a *corporeal* presence of the Lord Jesus in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, derived from the words 'the flesh profiteth nothing,' and is as follows:—

"'Dead flesh separated from the spirit in the gross manner they suppose they were to eat his flesh would profit nothing. Neither doth man's flesh, that is to say, man's natural and carnal apprehension (which refuses to be subject to the spirit and words of Christ) profit anything. But it would be the height of blasphemy to say the living flesh of Christ (which we receive in the blessed sacrament with His spirit, that is, with His soul and divinity) profiteth nothing. For if Christ's flesh had profiteth us nothing. He would never have taken flesh for us, nor died in the flesh for us.'

"Now the simple question is—in what sense did the Lord mean to be understood when using these words? And why does this note introduce interpretations which it was obviously out of the question either for Him to intend, or His hearers to imagine? Their difficulty was what they expressed; 'How can this man give us His flesh to eat?' Surely they could never suppose He would give them 'man's natural and carnal apprehension' to eat. Again, it said 'dead flesh separated from the spirit, in the gross manner they supposed they were to eat His flesh.' Now, where is there the slightest ground for asserting that they took His words in any such sense? Nothing had been said about 'dead flesh,' and their own expressions prove no such meaning had occurred to them. Their ground of perplexity was, as they describe it, 'how can a living man give us his flesh to eat.' So that two out of the three meanings ascribed in this note to His words are obviously, the one irrelevant, the other gratuitous.

"The third is certainly an instance of disingenuity almost unprecedented. Since it first *coolly assumes* the truth of the very thing to be proved by Roman Catholics, (and which I moreover believe to be effectually disproved thereby); and then proceeds, upon the *assumption of its truth*, to defend it from an objection, which no human being who *allowed its truth* could ever make, by an argument which is assuredly a *chef d'œuvre* of irrelevancy. Since it is just this—you cannot deny the efficacy of the mass, for it is true that Jesus Christ died on the cross. Now, we Protestants do deny the sacrifice of the mass, not because we disbelieve, but because we do believe, the sufficiency of the atonement; because we understand St. Paul to argue that repetition of sacrifice is the evidence of *insufficiency*. But it assuredly would be a strange way of arguing against us to reverse our position, and say—if you Protestants deny the *corporeal* presence of the Lord Jesus in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, you must also deny both the incarnation and the atonement of the Saviour. It is the height of blasphemy to deny the one, therefore it is also the height of blasphemy to deny the other.

"If this note contains, in this part of it, a *relevant argument*, this is what it asserts. It assumes what it should prove, namely, the truth of a *corporeal* presence! passes over, without the slightest notice the direct repugnancy between that supposition and these words of our Lord, which were meant to condemn any *carnal* view whatever of them: and then proceeds to condemn a depreciation of the efficacy of the sacrifice of the mass, which no one who *admitted its truth* could hold, by an argument of such irrelevancy as to be, I think, without parallel. For this last, if its words have any meaning, would run thus. The incarnation of Christ Jesus, the atonement of Christ Jesus, are facts; *therefore* the sacrifice of the mass is a fact likewise. If you disbelieve the latter, you must deny the former. The artifice consists, then, in the semblance of honesty, which seems to exhibit the truth of our Lord's words, though ascribing to them two senses, of which the one is gratuitous and the other impossible; in *assuming* as true a third, which they were suited to cor-

rect; and in omitting wholly the fourth, which they were intended and fitted to convey. Thus the sophistry escapes detection, and an occasion of correcting error becomes, in the hands of those who are determined not to be corrected, the means of hiding and propagating it."

"You have, I think," answered Father M., "shewn very plainly both the object and the errors of this note. What struck me had been, the assumption and the omission which you mention. I had been quite satisfied of its dishonesty, and grievously distressed by it."

"Have you ever read Cardinal Wiseman's Lectures on the Eucharist?" said Mr. R.

"No; I had no heart to take it up. I thought him a safe guide at first, and when I began to seek proofs of the infallibility of the Roman Catholic Church, I took his list of testimonies to it. But, upon examination, I found them very far, indeed, from proving what he asserted, and therefore I have no confidence in him."

"I am sorry you were not tempted to go a little further," said Mr. R. "You would have found, perhaps, additional ground of dissatisfaction with him, or I am much mistaken. He shows, in more instances than one, a most un-Romanist disregard of what others of his communion have said. In the present case he flatly contradicts the note of which we have been speaking. It avers, as we have seen, that the Jews *mistook* our Lord's meaning, and understood him in a 'gross,' 'vulgar,' and 'carnal' manner, which he sought to correct. The Cardinal, on the other side, alleges that they understood him rightly, and attaches so much importance to this view as to maintain that, if the Jews were, as this note alleges, *wrong* in their interpretation of our Lord's words, Protestants are right and Catholics are wrong in their doctrine."

Tom Connell's eyes opened pretty widely at this announcement, and he opened his mouth just as widely as his eyes, exclaiming, "I often heard that many Catholics, who daren't for their lives go the least mite or morsel agin the Church, care very little about going a great way agin the Bible. But it's a burning shame for a Cardinal, who ought to know better, to do the like."

"Take care, Tom, that you do not make a mistake, and do a wrong here," said Mr. R. "Cardinal Wiseman has said some strange things. And when he has an object in misleading Protestant Englishmen, who are lovers of freedom, as to the views of Roman Catholics, appears to me to care very little, at times, what he says. In the present case you must, however, remember it is not the actual text of the Bible which he contradicts, but a note in it, though that same note has been approved of by the prelates of his Church in this land. Our poor Roman Catholic countrymen are sadly deceived in thinking there are not quarrels enough, and bitter ones too, among those whom they are taught to believe can never err, or oppose each other. I have been sorely tempted, at times, to believe that the strongest bond of union among many of them is their hostility to Protestants."

"Maybe," said Tom, "it's something like some of the grand husbands and wives we hear tell of, who are mighty sweet to each other when they are on their good behaviour afore their company, but quarrel like cat and dog as soon as ever their backs are turned."

"That does not often occur with you and my kind nurse, Ellen, I am pretty sure, Tom," said Father M.; "And now (turning to the Rector), will you let me see what the Cardinal has said in contradiction of this?"

"That I can readily do," was the reply. And taking from his book-shelf Cardinal Wiseman's lectures on the Eucharist, read the following passages:—

"I assert, therefore, that if we accurately consider the phraseology of this portion of the chapter, according to the only manner in which it could possibly be understood by the Jews whom Christ addressed, we must be convinced that the doctrine now delivered was of a real eating of the flesh, and drinking of the blood of Him who addressed them."—p. 56.

"One thing now only remains to decide the question finally: were the Jews *right*, in so understanding Him, or were they *wrong*? If they were *right*, then so are Catholics, who likewise take his words literally; if *wrong*, then Protestants are right when they understand him figuratively."—94.

"While the Jews understood our Saviour to speak of *really* intending to give them His flesh to eat, if they were *wrong*, can we suppose Him to answer them by saying, that His flesh was *really* meat? or can we, under these circumstances, imagine Him to use the word at all, and that twice and emphatically—unless he wished to be taken literally?"—p. 121.

"These extracts are quite explicit," continued Mr. R. "The Cardinal's argument is, that as our Lord did not correct (which, however, I aver, he very clearly did) the sense which the Jews attached to His words, that sense must be the *right* one, and, on this supposition, founds the proof of his doctrine. His admission is, that if they were *wrong* in it, then the Protestant, and not the Roman Catholic view of the Eucharist must be correct."

"I'll muzzle the schoolmaster, and stop his mouth for ever more," cried out Tom Connell, in great exultation. "I have him now as sure as I'm alive. Won't it be a grand thing all out to get a great Cardinal, and their own Bible proving that Protestants are right, and that, all of

their own accord. That's grand. I never thought it would come to that with them."

"What do you mean, Tom?" said Mr. R.

"Why, your honour, haven't I it as clean as little Tommy's face on a Sunday morning? Doesn't the Cardinal say that *if the Jews were wrong*, then Protestants must be right? and doesn't his own Bible say that *they were wrong*? So isn't it 'a dead lock', that if their great bishop and their own Bible are *both* right (and if they allow either of them to be in the wrong, they're not likely soon to hear the end of that come down), they prove between them, without a morsel of help from us, that the Protestant doctrine is the true thing after all!"

"Bravo, Tom," said Mr. R. "You certainly have your old opponent on the horns of a dilemma there."

"And what is that, sir?" asked Tom, who pictured some escape for the schoolmaster in words which he dreaded because he did not understand. "You don't mean to say he can get out of it?"

"Indeed I do not," replied the clergyman, smiling at Tom's apprehensions. "You have him safe enough. You will just be like the executioner who should say to the man who resists being hung—die you must; but which would you like the knot to be tied under your right ear or your left?"

"Oh, I see now what you mean, sir," said Tom, somewhat relieved. "It's just what we say, 'out of the frying-pan into the fire.' Isn't that it?"

"I am afraid I should be puzzled to give you a better explanation of 'the horns of a dilemma,' your own will answer famously."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

In consequence of several persons having returned copies of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, which had been already paid for by friends, under the apprehension that they might be called on hereafter in person to pay for them, we beg to call their attention to the following announcement—viz., that any one receiving any number of this journal which has not been ordered by himself or by his authority, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, APRIL 17, 1857.

THAT a man who has adopted the belief that our Lord, in founding a Church which was to be the pillar and ground of the truth, endowed the Bishops of Rome with the peculiar privilege of infallibility, and constituted them to the end of time His vicars and vicegerents upon earth, who were, therefore, ordained to stand in His place, and by His authority to guide and rule the world, should submit himself absolutely and implicitly to such an authority, and even hold that all temporal authority should bow before it, appears to us to be not only rational, but reasonable. It would, indeed, we think, be the extreme of inconsistency to act otherwise upon such principles.

In arriving, however, at such a belief, one would naturally inquire, not only what is the nature of the evidence that the Bishops of Rome were appointed Christ's vicegerents, but how long has such authority been admitted or established. The study of history is obviously as necessary as that of theology, to enable any one to arrive at a safe conclusion in such matters. For we are not dealing with a newly granted or appointed institution, but one which, if it ever existed, was constituted eighteen centuries ago.

If the Bishops of Rome have at all times and under all circumstances, not only maintained pure and unchanged a given system of opinions, but have in the exercise of such divinely constituted power excluded all who differed from those opinions (as it must have been their duty to do) from church communion, their conduct would have been consistent with their claims, and one would have given the Popes, at least, credit for *believing* that, in real truth, these assumed prerogatives were divinely conferred upon them.

Should we, however, in studying the authentic